

# **Proposal Preparation Instructions**

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

**INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS OR QUOTERS**

**1.0 PROGRAM STRUCTURE AND OBJECTIVES**

The contract line item (CLIN) structure detail can be found in Section B - the Schedule. This section will outline the specifics for each CLIN. Fill in your price for each CLIN, broken down by basic and option years and aircraft (on applicable CLINs).

**2.0 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

- a. This section of the ITO provides general guidance for preparing proposals as well as specific instructions on the format and content of the proposal. The offeror's proposal must include all data and information requested by the ITO and must be submitted in accordance with these instructions. The offeror shall be compliant with the requirements as stated in the Statement of Objectives (SOO), Work Specifications, and Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL). **Non-conformance with the ITO may result in an unfavorable proposal evaluation.**
- b. The proposal shall be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. The proposal should not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements, but rather shall provide convincing rationale to address how the offeror intends to meet these requirements. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their facilities and experience, and will base its evaluation on the information presented in the offeror's proposal.
- c. Elaborate brochures or documentation, binding, detailed artwork, or other embellishments are unnecessary and are not desired.
- d. The proposal acceptance period is specified in Section A of the RFP. The offeror shall make a clear statement in Section A of the proposal documentation volume that the proposal is valid until this date in the proposal documentation volume.
- e. In compliance with FAR Subpart 4.8 (Government Contract Files), the Government will retain one copy of all unsuccessful proposals. Unless the Offeror requests otherwise, the Government will destroy extra copies of such unsuccessful proposals.

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

## 2.1 GENERAL INFORMATION

### 2.1.1. Point of Contact

The Contracting Officer (CO), Mrs. Carol Moyes is the **sole** point of contact for this acquisition. Address any questions or concerns you may have to the CO. Written requests for clarification may be sent to the CO at the address located in Section A of the RFP or by email at [carol.moyes@hill.af.mil](mailto:carol.moyes@hill.af.mil). Email is the preferred method of communication.

### 2.1.2. Debriefings

Offeror's may request debriefings pursuant to FAR 15.505 and FAR 15.506 by providing a written request to the CO within the designated timeframe.

### 2.1.3. Discrepancies

If an offeror believes that the requirements in these instructions contain an error, omission, or are otherwise unsound, the offeror shall immediately notify the CO in writing with supporting rationale. **The offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion.**

### 2.1.4 Reference Library

a. A reference library will be established containing Technical Orders (TO's). This library is located at Hill AFB, UT, Building 1216, LGHLA. For an appointment to review the TO's contact Rob Martin at 801-777-7610 or email [rob.martin@hill.af.mil](mailto:rob.martin@hill.af.mil). Offerors will not be allowed to remove the TO's from the Air Force location nor will authorization be given to photocopy. This service is provided at the Air Force's discretion and the Air Force reserves the right to specify the time, condition and location of the visit.

b. T.O's can be purchased by following these steps: obtain a DD Form 2345 by calling 1-800-352-3572, complete the form and attach a letter of intent outlining what you will do with the T.O., how it will benefit the government, and if your company is US-owned or foreign-owned. Fax the letter of intent and the DD 2345 to TIEDM, Hill AFB at 1-801-777-7763. You will be contacted and further instructions will be given then.

c. Military Specifications/Standards can be ordered from the Department of the Navy, Standardization Order Desk, Building #4, 700 Robins Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19111-5094, phone - 215-697-2179, 2667, 0159, 0158 or fax - 215-697-1462. You will need to provide them the point of contact in your organization, Mil. Spec./Standard needed, and the reason for needing the document.

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

### 2.1.5 Adequate Responses

Cursory responses or responses which merely reiterate or reformulate the Appendix A or Technical Orders will not be considered as being responsive to the requirements of the solicitation. Assurance of experience, capability, and qualifications, which clearly demonstrate and support the offeror's claim are essential. The absence of such evidence will adversely influence the evaluation of the proposal

### 2.2 ORGANIZATION / DISTRIBUTION / NUMBER OF COPIES / PAGE LIMITS

a. The offeror shall prepare the proposal as set forth in Table 1 below. The titles and contents of the volumes shall be as defined in this table, all of which shall be within the required page limits and with the number of copies as specified in Table 1. The volumes identified in the table should be separately bound in three-ring, loose-leaf binders. The contents of each proposal volume are described in the ITO paragraph as noted in the table below:

**Table 1. Proposal Organization**

VOLUME	ITO Paragraph Number	VOLUME TITLE	NO.OF PAPER COPIES	NO. OF ELECTRONIC COPIES	PAGE LIMIT
I	3.0	Executive Summary	2	2	4
II	4.0	Technical Proposal	4	4	200
III	5.0	Cost/Price Proposal	1	1	No Limit
IIII	6.0	Contract Documentation	1	1	No Limit
IV	7.0	Relevant Past and Present Performance	5	5	No Limit

#### 2.2.1 Page limitations

Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal and (for paper copies) will be returned to the offeror as soon as practicable. Page limitations shall be placed on responses to Evaluation Notices (EN). The specified page limits for EN responses will be identified in the letters forwarding the Ens to the Offerors. When both sides of a sheet display printed material, it shall be counted as 2 pages. Each page shall be counted except the following: Cover pages, table of contents, tabs, glossaries, resumes, and organizational structure change history.

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

### **2.2.2 Cost or Pricing Information**

All cost or pricing information shall be addressed ONLY in the Cost/Price Proposal and Contract Documentation Volumes. All dollar amounts provided in response to these instructions shall be rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

### **2.2.3 Cross Referencing**

To the greatest extent possible, each volume shall be written on a stand-alone basis so that its contents may be evaluated with a minimum of cross-referencing to other volumes of the proposal. Information required for proposal evaluation, which is not found in its designated volume, will be assumed to have been omitted from the proposal. Cross-referencing within a proposal volume is permitted where its use would conserve space without impairing clarity. The offeror shall provide a cross-reference matrix indicating, by ITO, SOO, and/or specification paragraph number, the corresponding proposal paragraph in that section which addresses the referenced item.

### **2.2.4 Indexing**

Each volume shall contain a more detailed table of contents to delineate the subparagraphs within that volume. Tab indexing shall be used to identify sections.

### **2.2.5 Hyperlink**

The table of Contents of all proposal volumes shall be hyperlinked to the corresponding material within each proposal volume such that “clicking” the mouse on an item in the Table of Contents will take the reader to the corresponding section within the body of the proposal volume.

### **2.2.6 Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms**

Each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used, with an explanation for each. Glossaries do not count against the page limitations for their respective volumes.

### **2.2.7 Page Size and Format**

a. **Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches**, not including foldouts. Pages shall be spaced / typed with **1.5 line spacing**. Except for the reproduced sections of the solicitation document, the text size shall be no less than 12 point. Tracking, kerning, and leading values shall not be changed from the default values of the word processing or page layout software. Use at least **one (1) inch margins on the top and bottom and 3/4 inch side margins**. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume. These page format restrictions shall apply to responses to Evaluation Notices (EN). These limitations shall apply to both electronic and hard copy proposals.

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

b. Legible tables, charts, graph and figures shall be used wherever practical to depict organizations, systems and layout, implementation schedules, plans, etc. These displays shall be uncomplicated, legible and shall not exceed 11 by 17 inches in size. Foldout pages shall fold entirely within the volume and count as a single page and be printed on only one side. Foldout pages may only be used for large tables, charts, graphs, diagrams and schematics, but not for pages of text. For tables, charts, graphs and figures, the text shall be no smaller than 10 point. These limitations shall apply to both electronic and hard copy proposals.

### **2.2.8 Binding and Labeling**

Each volume of the proposal should be separately bound in a three-ring loose-leaf binder, which shall permit the volume to lie flat when open. Staples shall not be used. A cover sheet should be found in each book, clearly marked as to volume number, title, copy number, RFP identification and the offeror's name. The same identifying data should be placed on the spine of each binder. All unclassified document binders shall have a color other than red or other applicable security designation colors. Be sure to apply all appropriate markings including those prescribed in accordance with FAR 52.215-1(e), Restriction on Disclosure and Use of Data, and 3.104-5, Disclosure, Protection, and Marking of Contractor Bid or Proposal Information and Source Selection Information.

### **2.2.9 Electronic Offers**

For electronic copies, submit the proposal on virus-free CD-ROMs, in either Adobe Acrobat file format or Microsoft Office 97. Each disk shall be properly labeled with volumes, file names, brief description, data restrictions, and cross-references. Use separate files to permit rapid location of all items, including exhibits, annexes and attachments, if any. There is no limit to the number of files or disks, which can be submitted as long as the page requirements of the proposal, are met. The paper and electronic copies shall be identical in all respects. The offeror shall provide a listing of the file names and the content of each file.

### **2.2.10 Distribution**

The “original” proposal shall be clearly identified. Proposals shall be addressed to the Contracting Officer and mailed to:

OO-ALC/LGJL  
Attn: Mrs. Carol Moyes  
6050 Gum Lane  
Hill AFB, UT, 84056-5820

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

### **3.0 VOLUME I - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In the executive summary volume, the offeror shall provide the following information:

#### **3.1 Narrative Summary**

The narrative summary shall include a concise summary of the entire proposal, including significant risks, and a highlight of any key or unique features, excluding cost/price. The salient features should also tie in with the Statement of Objectives (SOO). Any summary material presented shall not be considered as meeting the requirements for any portions of other volumes of the proposal.

#### **3.2 Contents**

A master table of contents of the entire proposal shall be included.

### **4.0 VOLUME II TECHNICAL PROPOSAL**

The Technical Volume should be specific and complete. Legibility, clarity and coherence are very important. Your responses will be evaluated against the Technical factors defined in Section M, Evaluation Factors for award. Using the instructions provided below, provide as specifically as possible the actual methodology you would use for accomplishing / satisfying these factors. All the requirements specified in the solicitation are mandatory. By your proposal submission, you are representing that your firm will perform all the requirements specified in the solicitation and Appendix A. It is not necessary or desirable for you to tell us so in your proposal. Do not merely reiterate the objectives or reformulate the requirements specified in the solicitation.

#### **4.1 Formats and Specific content**

##### **4.1.1**

Technical and Proposal risk will be addressed in the Technical volume. In this volume, address your proposal approach to meeting the requirements of each Technical Factor, as well as the risks in your proposal approach in terms of technical capability / performance, cost and/or schedule. Address Proposal Risk by identifying those aspects of the proposal you consider to involve cost and/or technical capability risk and classify each in accordance with AFFARS 5315.305(a)(3)(ii). Provide the rationale for the impact of each risk and its rating, including quantitative estimates of the impact on cost, schedule, and performance. Describe the impact of each identified risk in terms of its potential to interfere with or prevent the successful accomplishment of other contract requirements (for example: Appendix A) whether or not those requirements are identified as factors. Suggest a realistic “work-around” or risk mitigator

“DRAFT”  
**SECTION L (12 Sept 02)**

for identified risks that will eliminate or reduce risk to an acceptable level. Identify and classify any new risks introduced by such risk mitigation.

#### **4.1.2 Volume Organization**

The technical volume shall be organized according to the following general outline:

- Table of contents
- List of tables and drawings
- Glossary
- Cross Reference Matrix
- Sub-factor 1
- Sub-factor 2
- Sub-factor 3
- Sub-factor 4
- Sub-factor 5
- Sub-factor 6
- Risk Matrix

#### **4.2 MISSION CAPABILITY FACTOR**

##### **4.2.1 SUB-FACTOR 1: Repair/Delivery**

DESCRIPTION: The offeror shall provide a concise step-by-step description of the processes that demonstrates the offerors understanding of the Work Specification. Using a flow chart format, provide a brief narrative of the offerors process for accomplishing a 40-day delivery or better. Describe the process for each of the following:

- KC135R Shock Strut, NSN 1620-01-143-1154
- C130 Ballscrew, NSN 1620-00-677-6681
- KC135R Steering Valve, NSN 1620-01-208-9756
- C130 Main Gear, NSN 1620-01-170-8325
- E3 Nose Gear, NSN 1620-01-096-4597
- E3 Main Gear, NSN 1620-01-015-2152
- E3 Brace Assy, NSN 1620-01-098-2808

The process must reflect 100 percent repair and indicate the time required for each step in the process. Identify in the process where any subcontracting is performed



“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

**4.2.2 SUB-FACTOR 2: Transition/Phase-In**

DESCRIPTION: The offeror shall provide a Transition/Phase-In plan, which identifies the preparatory steps necessary to provide support under the contract. The plan must reflect a logical, planned sequence of events resulting in identifying and obtaining resources needed, including subcontractors, for contract performance by including the following.

- a. Milestones on preparation for hiring, staffing, management, relocation of personnel, training of personnel, ordering materials, tooling up, facilities, forms and documentation, technical data and work packages, quality assurance, repair and overhaul process, and workload phase-in.

**4.2.3 SUB-FACTOR 3: Process Control / Quality Assurance**

DESCRIPTION: The offeror shall provide details on the following:

- a. Location and capabilities of prime and subcontractors test facilities and personnel to be used for the maintenance of the chemical processes. Test requirements include but not limited to chemical analysis of solutions and physical testing of coatings (such as corrosion protection, hydrogen embrittlement, adhesion, wear resistance).
- b. Location of the test facility in relation to the processes being controlled.
- c. Provisions for calibration of critical measuring equipment such as micrometers and temperature gages.
- d. Provisions for determining bake and heat-treat oven temperature uniformity and accuracy.
- e. A narrative description of the offeror's program for Quality Assurance such as is described in ANSI/ASQC Q9002, MIL-I-45208A with paragraph 3.3 and 3.5 of MIL-Q-9858A, or an equivalent Quality Program and demonstrates how management and work force are involved in the quality assurance programs.

**4.2.4 SUB-FACTOR 4: Facilities, Equipment, and Processes**

DESCRIPTION: The offeror shall provide a description of all facilities to be used for this contract. The description shall include the following:

- a. Geographic location of all facilities.
- b. A facility layout and general routing for the prime contractor's and any subcontractor's facilities showing where each process (mechanical and chemical), will be performed and show the following:

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

(1) Identify the processes to be performed and the location(s) for the performance of those processes.

(2) A diagram showing the routing between facilities, including subcontractors, with approximate distance by road, in miles, between the facilities. If facilities are on the same or adjacent property, so state.

(3) Show how time critical processes are co-located to allow the process to be performed within the time limit.

(4) Identify that the facilities, equipment, and processes to be used for this contract exist and are operational.

(5) Identify any additional facilities, processes, and equipment that will be added and identify the time frame when the contractor will acquire their additional needs.

c. How the prime and subcontractors will accomplish transportation between the various proposed facilities showing how parts will be protected from damage and how the extra transportation time will affect the total flow days.

d. Construction and condition of all facilities showing sound construction.

e. Evidence of high bay areas, up to 18 feet high for processing of large assemblies.

f. Evidence of sufficient protected storage for storage of government owned assets to prevent damage, corrosion, and/or loss.

g. Information showing the size and weight of parts that can be handled through each of the processes.

**4.2.5 SUB-FACTOR 5: Corporate, Technical, and Maintenance Personnel**

DESCRIPTION: The offeror shall provide a narrative description of the personnel experience, qualification, and education/training in the overhaul of aircraft landing gear. Personnel refers to all employees that will be involved with the overhaul process, which includes, but are not limited to management, engineering/technical, planning, and production personnel. If any subcontractors are to be used in the overhaul process, this information must also be provided for each subcontractor.

a. Management personnel descriptions should address experience in the area of management for the overhaul of aircraft landing gear.

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

- b. Engineering and technical personnel descriptions should address education and their experience in the overhaul of aircraft landing gear as well as their experience in the controlling of the processes required to overhaul aircraft landing gear.
- c. Planning personnel descriptions should address their experience in the overhaul of aircraft landing gear.
- d. Production personnel should address their training and experience in the overhaul of aircraft landing gear.
- e. Personnel descriptions should also be included for any other key employees that will be involved in the overhaul of landing gear, such as a liaison between the Air Force and the contractor, work schedulers, etc.
- f. The overhaul of aircraft landing gear refers to, but are not limited to the following operations: disassembly, cleaning, baking, evaluation and inspection, flame spray, external and internal grinding, machining and lathe operations, milling, non-destructive inspection, plating, shot peening, temper etch, assembly, painting, and testing.
- g. The offeror shall provide a description of how they intend to communicate with Air Force engineering personnel on matters such as part non-conformance's. The description should also include a sample of any forms that may be used in the correspondence.

**4.2.6 SUB-FACTOR 6: Production Planning, Tooling Development and Acquisition Capability**

DESCRIPTION: The offeror shall provide the following:

- a. A narrative description of the offeror's plan and/or program that i.e. schedules, tracks, identify problems, trends and resolutions, and tracks GFM/CAP usage trends for all planned repair activities including subcontractors.
- b. Address how the USAF requirements will be prioritized within the offerors existing workload obligations including any subcontractors that will be used in the repair process.
- c. In the event of special circumstances, the contractor may be asked to surge repair requirements. Provide a brief description on how the offeror will accommodate a surge repair request.
- d. A narrative description of their capability to design, develop, and manufacture and/or procure tooling and fixtures used in the overhaul process of landing gear. The tooling shall include all disassembly, machining, plating, assembly, and test fixtures required by the contractor and any subcontractor used.

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

e. A narrative description of their capability/method to manufacture and/or procure expendable hardware items that are part of the overhaul process as identified in the applicable technical orders or may not be available on time in the Government Furnished Material system.

f. Address how the manufacture and/or procurement of the hardware and tooling may affect the repair and overhaul process. This will include a narrative of how the contractor plans to include the manufacture and/or procurement of such items into the scheduled usage of any machine/personnel used in the repair and overhaul process.

## **5.0 VOLUME III COST/PRICE VOLUME**

### **5.1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

#### **5.1.1 Prime Objective of Cost Proposal**

The primary purpose of your cost proposal is to provide the Ogden Air Logistics Center (OO-ALC) cost team evaluators with a clear understanding of how your cost estimates were developed and to support price reasonableness.

#### **5.1.2 Cost or Pricing Information Requirements**

In accordance with FAR 15.403-1(b) and 15.403-3(a), information other than cost or pricing data may be required to support price reasonableness. This information is not considered cost or pricing data and thus certification is not required. This information shall be provided in accordance with FAR 15.403-5. If, after receipt of proposals, the PCO determines that there is insufficient information available to determine price reasonableness and none of the exceptions in FAR 15.403-1 apply, the offeror shall be required to submit cost or pricing data.

#### **5.1.3 Pagination**

Every page of the Cost Proposal Volume shall be numbered.

#### **5.1.4 Cost Reimbursement CLINS**

Reference the solicitation for CLIN identification. Note, these CLINS will not be a part of the Total Evaluated Price.

#### **5.1.5 Firm Fixed Price (FFP) CLINS**

Proposed dollar amounts should be in Then Year (TY) dollars based on the applicable period. The unit repair prices should include applicable direct labor, labor overheads, indirect expenses, materials, subcontracting costs, other direct costs, and profit. It is not necessary to provide cost information for the FFP CLINS other than that requested for the **Repair/Delivery / Sample Task Items**.

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

### **5.1.6 Fixed Hourly Rate CLINS**

The offeror is requested to provide Fixed Hourly Labor Rates for CLINS X005-X007. These rates shall include all applicable indirect cost and profit. These will be the billable rates to the government for all hours expended in performance of the corresponding CLIN.

## **5.2 SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS**

### **5.2.1 Format and Organization**

The Cost/Price Volume shall be organized in accordance with the following general outline:

- Section 1: Schedule B
- Section 2: Estimating Methodology and Rationale For Prices
- Section 3: Disclosure Statement
- Section 4: Pricing Assumptions
- Section 5: Government Furnished Support
- Section 6: Repair/Delivery / Sample Task Items
- Section 7: Subcontractors
- Section 8: Table TEP Evaluated Price Worksheet
- Section 9: Cost Risk Assessment
- Section 10: Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms Used

### **5.2.2 Section 1: Schedule B.**

Include a completed copy of the RFP section titled “SOLICITATION/CONTRACT PART I - THE SCHEDULE - SECTION B, SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICES/COSTS”

### **5.2.3 Section 2: Estimating Methodology and Rationale for Prices.**

Provide a summary description of your standard estimating system or methods. Provide a summary description of your purchasing system or methods. Identify deviations (if any) from your standard estimating procedures in preparing this proposal volume. Indicate whether you have Government approval of your estimating and purchasing systems and provide evidence of such approval. Provide a summary description of your pricing methodology as it pertains to this acquisition. **This section shall not exceed three pages.**

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

**5.2.4 Section 3: Disclosure Statement.**

State whether or not your Disclosure Statement has been determined adequate by the cognizant government ACO. If determined adequate, provide date of approval. Identify any outstanding CAS violations, and provide status/action being taken. If exempted from submitting a CAS Disclosure Statement so state, and identify the reason for the exemption.

**5.2.5 Section 4: Pricing Assumptions.**

Summarize your significant pricing assumptions, scope limitations and/or qualifications of the cost proposal.

**5.2.6 Section 5: Government Furnished Support**

Any government furnished support, which you have requested (e.g., GFP, GFE, base support, facilities, test equipment etc.) in addition to that specified in the RFP, shall be listed on a separate schedule by individual item and estimated value.

**5.2.7 Section 6: Repair/Delivery / Sample Task Items**

For the items identified in Sub-Factor 1, Mission Capability, it is requested that the offeror provide cost breakdowns for the basic year only. The cost breakdowns shall include all applicable cost elements such as labor hours, labor rates, applicable overheads, direct materials, other direct costs, subcontract costs, and profit. Provide a brief explanation and cost justification for these cost elements.

**5.2.8 Section 7: Subcontractors**

Identify the name(s) of your major subcontractor(s), the type of contract anticipated, an explanation of the subcontract effort, the degree of competition obtained, basis for the selection of each subcontractor, and the rationale for determining that the proposed prices are reasonable and realistic for the anticipated subcontract effort.

**“DRAFT”**

## SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

The offeror shall complete and submit Table TEP to be used for evaluation and award purposes only. Submit in “Then-Year” dollars for the Basic and all applicable Option periods (Nine Options). Provide basic/option period totals as well as a Grand Total.

### Table TEP

<u>Price Arrangement Description</u>	<u>CLIN Series</u>	Government <u>Estimated QTY Hours</u>	<u>Loaded Rate</u>	<u>Est Total Price</u>
Not Separately Priced	X0001-X0004	(Will Not Be Evaluated)		
Fixed Hourly Labor Rates	X0005		\$	\$
Fixed Hourly Labor Rates	X0006		\$	\$
Fixed Hourly Labor Rates	X0007		\$	\$
Cost Reimb No Fee	X0008	(Will Not Be Evaluated)		
CLINs Deleted in RFP	X0009	(Will Not Be Evaluated)		
		<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Unit Price</u>	<u>Total Price</u>
FFP CLINs	X0010-X0134		\$	\$
<b>GRAND TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE &gt;</b>				<b>\$</b>

### 5.2.9 Cost Risk Assessment Summary.

Request you limit this to two pages or less. Submit a summary cost risk analysis which identifies cost risk areas and your management approach to mitigating/controlling the impact of those cost risks on the overall success of the program.

COST RISK AREAS	MITIGATION
Identify and discuss the significant cost risk issues.	Explain your plans for mitigation

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

## **6.0 VOLUME IV - CONTRACT DOCUMENTATION**

### **6.1 Representations and Certifications.**

The purpose of this volume is to provide information to the Government for preparing the contract document and supporting file. The offeror's proposal shall include Sections A through K. This includes:

- a. Completion of blocks 13 and 15 and signature and date for block 27 of the SF 1447. Signature by the offeror on the SF 1447 constitutes an offer, which the Government may accept. The "original" copy should be clearly marked under separate cover and should be provided without any punched holes.
- b. Section B – Complete pricing and delivery information on all applicable banks in Section B corresponding to individual CLINs (see also Section F). The offeror shall propose its own delivery schedule by completing the proposed schedule is subject to the following guidance: Proposed delivery schedules must meet a delivery 40 days after time of receipt of funds, reparables, or GFM, whichever is later.
- c. Complete Contract Quality Requirements, as applicable.
- d. Section G - Complete blocks for the Activity Address Code located in Part 1, Section G.
- e. Section F – Representations and Certifications. Complete representations, certifications, acknowledgments and statements, as applicable.

### **6.2 Exceptions to terms and conditions.**

Exceptions taken to terms and conditions of the RFP or to any of its formal attachments shall be identified. Each exception shall be specifically related to each paragraph and/or specific part of the RFP to which the exception is taken. Provide rationale in support of the exception and fully explain its impact, if any, on the performance, schedule and cost and specific requirements of the RFP. This information shall be provided in the format and content of Table 6.2. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the RFP may result in the offeror being removed from consideration for award.



“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

**Table 6.2 - RFP EXCEPTIONS**

<b><i>RFP Document</i></b>	<b><i>Paragraph /Page</i></b>	<b><i>Requirement/ Portion</i></b>	<b><i>Rationale</i></b>
<i>SOW, SPEC, ITO, etc.</i>	<i>Applicable Page and Paragraph Numbers</i>	<i>Identify the requirement or portion to which exception is taken</i>	<i>Justify why the requirement will not be met</i>

### **6.3 OTHER INFORMATION REQUIRED.**

#### **6.3.1 Authorized Offeror Personnel**

Provide the name, title and telephone number of the company/division point of contact regarding source selection decisions made with respect to your proposal and who can obligate your company contractually. Also, identify those individuals authorized to negotiate with the Government.

#### **6.3.2 COMPANY/DIVISION STREET ADDRESS**

Provide company/division's street address, county and facility code; size of business (large or small); and labor surplus area designation. This same information must be provided if the work for this contract will be performed at any other location(s). List all locations where work is to be performed and indicate whether such facility is a division, affiliate, or subcontractor, and the percentage of work to be performed at each location.

#### **6.3.3 ATTACHMENTS TO THE PROPOSAL.**

The offeror shall provide the following as attachments to the proposal.

##### **6.3.3.1 SUBCONTRACTING PLAN**

Include a Subcontracting Plan in accordance with (IAW) FAR 19.702. The plan must be approved by the PCO before contract award. If the offeror is not required to submit a subcontracting plan, the offeror must describe the percentage of the proposed effort to be performed by small businesses, small disadvantaged businesses and large businesses.

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

### 6.3.3.2 GFE Requirements.

The Government plans to provide the items listed in Appendix B Attachment 6 of the RFP as GFE. If the offeror requires the use of Government furnished items other than those specified, the offeror should provide a listing including quantity, federal stock number, nomenclature, date needed and duration of availability, rental value per FAR Section 45.1 and 45.2, reason for need and provide cross reference to cost/price volume paragraphs which pertain to GFE. The offeror should also provide the written authorization from the cognizant ACO, as applicable. The offeror shall supply this information in the format shown in Table 6.3.

**Table 6.3 - Required Information for using GFE**

<u><b>Quan- tity</b></u>	<u><b>Federal Stock #</b></u>	<u><b>Nomen- clature</b></u>	<u><b>Duration of Need</b></u>	<u><b>Rental Value</b></u>	<u><b>Reason for Need</b></u>	<u><b>Cross Ref. to Cost Prop</b></u>
2 EA	FS156- 09-234	ACG- 1372 Time Counter	1 Oct 93 - 30 Dec 94	\$1,000	Needed to calibrate our 5 mhz/1pps SATCOM simulator offset	Volume III- 23 - 27

### 6.3.3.4 Attachment Description

A Statement of Objectives (SOO) is provided as an attachment to the RFP. This SOO represents the Government's minimum objectives for the Landing Gear Overhaul and Repair acquisition. The Offeror shall use the SOO to propose a WBS-structured SOW, which expands upon these minimum objectives to the extent necessary to conduct this acquisition. The proposed SOW shall define the tasks required for ensuring all minimum requirements of the government provided SOO and preliminary WBS have been addressed. The proposed SOW shall consist of tasking statements. Each tasking statement shall reference the CDRL items, which will be delivered by that task. The proposed SOW shall not contain informational notes, as the Technical Proposal provides ample opportunity for discussion and description of the Offeror's approach. The tasking statements in the SOW, and elements of the CWBS shall use a common numbering system. The proposed SOW, when accepted by the Government, will be incorporated into the contract by reference.

## 7.0 VOLUME V RELEVANT PRESENT AND PAST PERFORMANCE

### 7.1 GENERAL.

Each offeror shall submit a present and past performance volume with its proposal in accordance with the format contained in Attachments 1 and 2 . Offerors are advised that the Government will use data provided by each offeror and data obtained from other sources to assign a performance risk rating to the offeror's proposal.

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

**7.2 EARLY PROPOSAL INFORMATION.**

Offerors shall submit the Volume V, Relevant Present and Past Performance, as soon as possible, but prior to the cost/price proposal submittal and no later than the date offers are due. Failure to submit Early Proposal Information will not result in offer disqualification. Submit Volume V to: Ms. Carol Moyes, the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO), 6050 Gum Lane, Bldg 1215, Hill AFB, Utah 84056.

**7.3 RELEVANT CONTRACTS.**

Submit information on contracts that you consider relevant in demonstrating your ability to perform the proposed effort. This information may include data on efforts performed by other divisions, corporate management, critical subcontractors, or teaming contractors, if such resources will be brought to bear or significantly influence the performance of the proposed effort. The offeror shall submit documentation identifying all active and completed prime contracts or subcontracts (Government or Commercial) performed by the offeror (within the same division or cost center) up to 5 years before this solicitation date.

**7.3.1 SPECIFIC CONTENT.**

Offerors may include an explanatory introduction to Volume V. Offerors are required to explain what aspects of the contracts are deemed relevant to the proposed effort and may include a discussion of significant achievements or explain past problems they consider relevant to the proposed efforts as well as past efforts to identify and manage program risk. Categorize the relevant information into the specific evaluation areas/factors used to evaluate the proposal.

**7.3.2 PAGE LIMITS.**

Responses are limited to four pages per contract and a maximum of 45 pages for the entire volume (this includes and Volume V introductory pages).

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

**ATTACHMENT 1: KEY PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS SUMMARY**

All resumes need not be in this format, however, each must include the following data:

**1. NAME:**

**2. TITLE:**

**3. JOB CATEGORY/LEVEL:**

Current and Proposed Category/Level,  
Identify the appropriate percentage of the individual's time that will be dedicated to proposed program.

**4. EDUCATION:**

College/University/Degree/Graduate Degree/Courses/Year  
Professional Courses/Title/Year

**5. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE SUMMARY:**

Number of years experience in a particular field or area, particularly DOD acquisition experience, together with years of experience with specific systems.

**6. SPECIFIC EXPERIENCE:**

Job Assignment - Present

Job Assignment - Past

**7. DOD ACQUISITION EXPERIENCE:**

Number of years -  
Description of experience -

**8. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND ACHIEVEMENTS:**

Awards  
Significant Publications  
Professional Societies  
Specific On-the-Job Meritorious Achievements

**“DRAFT”**

## Past Performance Questionnaire

The Landing Gear Repair acquisition is placing emphasis on past performance. Please complete this form for each applicable contract and include it as part of your proposal. Please include the completed form in your proposal in the same format it has been provided to you. **(NOTE: You are responsible for ensuring this information is current and accurate. Incomplete or inaccurate information could adversely impact your past performance assessment. )** We will use this information to validate your past performance data. These surveys will be sent to the points of contact you provide below. Please be sure all the information is complete. If the individual does not have e-mail access, please so indicate.

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Questionnaire Point of Contact: \_\_\_\_\_

Name	Phone	E-mail Address
------	-------	----------------

Previous or current contract similar to this solicitation: (Note: Performance under contracts submitted must have occurred during the past seven (7) years)

Contract #		Title/Description		Client	Period of Performance	Dollar Value

Was this contract awarded to you under your current company name? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If NO, state previous company name contract awarded to:

What was the Cage Code under which this contract was awarded:

Description of services provided and scope of contract:

Please list any problems encountered in the performance of this contract and what you did to rectify those problems:

[illegible]

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

Provide the following points of contact for positions held during the contract period of performance:

Point of Contact or Company Equivalent	Name	(Area Code) Number	e-mail address (if none, indicate so)	mailing address w/ zip code
Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO)				
Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO)				
Contracting Officer Technical Representative (COTR), if appl.				
Program Manager				
Technical Rep.- state specialty (e.g. test engineer, data mgr.)				
If you were a subcontractor on this contract, identify the prime contractors PCO				
Other- please indicate title				

Note: Part of our validation process will involve asking the references you have provided here whether or not any contractual actions have been taken on your programs (e.g. show cause letters or late notices). If you have identified a contract where contractual action has been initiated, please explain the circumstances, the action taken and your solution, within the page limitations indicated in Clause L-900 of the RFP. Do not provide the information on this questionnaire.

**Confine your responses to the spaces provided in this questionnaire! Do not use the space below. Any additional information you want to provide must be done so in accordance with the two-page limit described in Section L, L-900, of the RFP.**

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

**Past Performance Questionnaire  
Instructions**

Company Name: Self-explanatory

Questionnaire Point of Contact: Individual responsible for filling out the questionnaire. This information is required in case there is some question on the data required.

Previous or Current applicable contract: Identify the contract you would like us to use in our evaluation of your performance. The referenced contract must be similar to the statement of work in the solicitation.

Contract Number: Self-explanatory

Contract Type: Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity, Fixed Price, Cost Plus, etc.

Contract Title/Description: Contract title or program name

Role: Identify whether you were the prime contractor on this contract or a subcontractor. If you were the subcontractor, identify the company to which you were subcontracting.

Client: Identify the customer this contract was supporting.

Period of Performance: Start and end dates, including all option years, for the referenced contract

Dollar Value: The value of the contract over the life of the contract

**EXAMPLE:**

Contract #	Type	Title/Description	Role	Client	Period of Performance	Dollar Value
FDXXXXXX	FFP	Similar Contract	Sub (XYZ Co.)	AFMC/XX	May 91-Present	\$10M

Current company name?: This question is for those companies who may have been recently absorbed into a new company and do not have any applicable past performance under this new company, but think their past performance under the previous company should be considered.

Cage Code?: Provide the cage code of the contractor (that was or should have been listed on the front of the contract) to whom this contract was awarded. If it was your company, but was a different division of the same company, please make sure that the cage code you report is the cage code that actually appeared on the contract referenced.

“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

Description of services and scope: Provide a *brief* description of the services provided to indicate how this referenced contract is applicable to this solicitation. Identify the scope of the contract, to include users, to provide an idea of the magnitude and complexity of this referenced contract.

Problems Encountered in performance: Provide a brief description of any major problems you encountered in the performance of this contract and what measures or steps were taken to alleviate those problems on the instant contract and any future contracts.

Point of Contact: These individuals will be provided our past performance survey requesting their feedback on the date you have provided in this questionnaire. The points of contact should be individuals who held the following positions during the contract period of performance.

PCO: The individual responsible for authorizing work under this contract

ACO: The individual responsible for administering the contract

COTR: The liaison between the contracting staff and the technical staff

Program Manager: The individual responsible for cost, schedule, and performance of this contract.

Tech. Rep.: The individual who is responsible for overseeing the effort under this contract that falls within their particular functional specialty

Prime Contractors PCO: For subcontractors, the prime contractors individual responsible for authorizing work under this contract.

Other: Any other points of contact you feel may provide a necessary alternate perspective from those listed above. Please specify the individuals job position during the referenced period of performance.



“DRAFT”  
SECTION L (12 Sept 02)

**ATTACHMENT 3: CROSS REFERENCE MATRIX**

For Prospective Offerors: See paragraph 2.3.6 regarding instructions for completion of the RFP Cross Reference Matrix. If this matrix conflicts with any other requirement, direction or provision of this solicitation, the other reference shall take precedence over this matrix. Additionally, to the extent this matrix discloses details as to the extent or manner by which the Government intends to evaluate offeror's proposals for award, Section M references in the matrix are for information purposes only and the Government shall be obligated to evaluate proposals solely in conformance with the provisions of the Section M of the solicitation.

An example of the format is shown below:

<i><b>RFP CROSS REFERENCE MATRIX</b></i>								
<i>REQ. DOC.</i>	<i>WORK REQ</i>	<i>WBS LEVEL</i>	<i>CLIN</i>	<i>Section L</i>	<i>Section M</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>CSOW</i>	<i>CDRL</i>
<i>3.2.2</i>	<i>Design B</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0001</i>					<i>N/A</i>
<i>3.3.3</i>	<i>Build A</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0002</i>	<i>3.B.2</i>				<i>A001</i>

## **Evaluation Factors for Award**

PART IV-REPRESENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS  
SECTION M (21 Oct 02)  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

## **1.0 SOURCE SELECTION**

### **1.1 Basis For Contract Award**

The Government will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of Technical Capability, Past Performance, Proposal Risk, and Price/Cost. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS) 5315.3 Source Selection and the AFMC supplement (AFMCFARS) thereto. The contract will be awarded to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors to represent the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to the offeror who gives the Air Force the greatest confidence that it will best meet or exceed the requirements affordably. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the technical superiority and/or overall business approach and/or superior past performance of the higher price offeror outweighs the cost difference. To arrive at a source selection decision, the SSA will integrate the source selection team's evaluations of the evaluation factors (described below). While the Government source selection evaluation team and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective and, therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

### **1.2 Number of Contracts to be awarded**

The government intends to award one (1) contract for the Program.

### **1.3 Rejection of Unrealistic Offers**

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, including contract terms and conditions, or unrealistically high or low in cost when compared to Government estimates, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

### **1.4 Correction Potential of Proposals**

The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency or proposal inadequacy. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an offeror's proposal not meeting the Government's requirements is not considered correctable, the offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range.

PART IV-REPRESENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS  
SECTION M (21 Oct 02)  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

### **1.5 Competitive Advantage from Use of GFP**

The Government will eliminate any competitive advantage resulting from an offeror's proposed use of Government-furnished property (GFP)

## **2.0 EVALUATION FACTORS**

### **2.1 Evaluation Factors and their Relative Order of Importance**

Award will be made to the offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and subfactors described below. The evaluation factors listed below are in order of importance. Within the Mission Capability factor, the subfactors are listed in order of importance.

**Factor 1: Mission Capability**

**Factor 2: Past Performance**

**Factor 3: Proposal Risk**

**Factor 4: Price/Cost**

All Proposals will be evaluated as to the extent of participation of SDB firms. Offerors will provide targets for SDB participation, expressed as dollars and percentages of total contract value, in each of the applicable and authorized SIC Major Groups as well as a total target for SDB participation as joint venture partners, team members, or subcontractors. The authorized SIC Major Groups are 10, 12-17, 22-31, 34, 36-42, 44, 46-65, 67, 70, 73, 75, 76, 80, 82, 87, and 89. These targets will be incorporated into and become a part of the contract. The successful offeror will be required to provide reports on SDB subcontractor participation in accordance with FAR clause 52.219-25 in Section I of the contract.

If the offeror is other than a small business, the offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan submitted in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 and Section L paragraph ----shall also be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror identifies and commits to the participation of SB, HBCU, and MI whether as joint venture members, teaming arrangement, or subcontractor. Failure to submit such a plan will render the offeror ineligible for award.

### **2.2 Importance of Cost/Price**

In accordance with FAR 15.304(e), the evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price; however, cost/price will contribute substantially to the selection decision.

PART IV-REPRESENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS  
SECTION M (21 Oct 02)  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

### 2.3 Factor and subfactor Rating

A color rating will be assigned to each subfactor under the Mission Capability factor. The color rating depicts how well the offeror's proposal meets the Mission Capability subfactor requirements in accordance with the stated explanation, within the subfactor, of how the subfactor will be evaluated. The Mission Capability subfactors are described in paragraph 2.5 below. A proposal risk rating will be assigned to each of the Mission Capability subfactors. Proposal risk represents the risks identified with an offeror's proposed approach as it relates to the Mission Capability subfactor. A Performance Confidence Assessment will be assigned to the Past Performance factor. Performance confidence represents the Government's assessment of the probability of an offeror successfully performing as proposed and is derived from an evaluation of the offeror's present and past work record. Cost/price will be evaluated as described in paragraph 3.0 below. When the integrated assessment of all aspects of the evaluation is accomplished, the color ratings, proposal risk ratings, performance confidence assessment, and evaluated cost/price will be considered in the order of priority listed in paragraph 2.1 above. Any of these considerations can influence the SSA's decision.

### 2.4 Factor 1 - Mission Capability

Each subfactor within the Mission Capability Factor will receive one of the color ratings described in AFFARS 5315.305(a)(3)(i), based on the assessed strengths and proposal inadequacies of each offeror's proposal as they relate to each of the Mission Capability subfactor. Subfactor ratings shall not be rolled up into an overall color rating for the Mission Capability factor.

In arriving at a best value decision, the Government reserves the right to give positive consideration for performance in excess of threshold requirements.

Color	Rating	Definition
<b>Green</b>	<b>Exceptional</b>	Exceeds specified minimum performance or capability requirements in a way beneficial to the Government.
	<b>Acceptable</b>	Meets specified minimum performance capability requirements necessary for acceptable contract performance.
<b>Yellow</b>	<b>Marginal</b>	Does not clearly meet some specified minimum performance or capability requirements necessary for acceptable contract performance, but any proposal inadequacies are correctable
	<b>Unacceptable</b>	Fails to meet specified minimum performance or capability requirements Proposals with an unacceptable rating are not awardable.

PART IV-REPRESENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS  
SECTION M (21 Oct 02)  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

**Sub-Factor 1: Repair/Delivery.** The government will assess the offeror's knowledge, understanding, and capability to meet the requirements IAW the Work Specification and this solicitation. The standard is met when the Offeror demonstrates a clear understanding of all necessary steps in proper sequence to accomplish 100% repair in 40 days or better. Consideration will be given to a shorter but realistic delivery schedule.

**Sub-Factor 2: Transition/Phase-in.** The government will assess the offeror's knowledge, ability and resources necessary to ensure a smooth transition and phase-in period. The standard is met when the Offeror demonstrates a clear understanding of the requirement and presents a sound approach for meeting the following:

- a. Resources and Personnel
- b. Hiring and staffing, management, scheduling, relocation and/or training of personnel, ordering materials requirements, tooling up, faculties, forms and documentation, technical data and work packages, quality assurance, repair and overhaul processes, and workload phase-in.

**Sub-Factor 3: Process Control/Quality Assurance.** The government will assess the offeror's capability, knowledge and understanding of the Process Control as it relates to proximities and capabilities of the prime and subcontractors necessary to meet the requirements specified IAW the WS and the solicitation. Additionally, the government will assess the offeror's Quality Assurance Plan for the services provided to meet the requirements of the WS and the solicitation, taking into consideration experienced personnel, monitoring and inspection processes, and discrepancy tracking and correction methodology. The standard is met when the offeror demonstrates the capability and understanding of process control and quality assurance.

**Sub-Factor 4: Facilities, Equipment, and Processes.** The government will assess the geographic locations of facilities, equipment, processes, routing, and potential subcontractors proposed to meet the requirements of the WS and the solicitation. The standard is met when the Offeror demonstrates the ability to reliably meet workload requirements.

**Sub-Factor 5: Corporate, Technical, and Maintenance Personnel.** The government will assess the offeror's organizational structure and proposed personnel to support the requirements of the WS and the solicitation. The standard is met when the offeror demonstrates their company(s) personnel have the experience and skill mix as well as adequate manning, and training program to support the workload.

**Sub-Factor 6: Production Planning, Tooling Development and Acquisition Capability.** The government will assess the Offeror's knowledge and understanding of Production Planning, Tooling Development and Acquisition Capabilities to meet the requirements specified IAW the solicitation. The standard is met when the offeror

PART IV-REPRESENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS  
SECTION M (21 Oct 02)  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

demonstrates the ability to meet production planning, hardware and tooling development, acquisition capabilities, and potential surge repair requirements.

## **2.5 Factor 2: Past Performance Factor**

Under Past Performance factor, the Performance Confidence Assessment represents the evaluation of an offeror's present and past work record to assess the Government's confidence in the offeror's probability of successfully performing as proposed. The Government will evaluate the offeror's demonstrated record of contract compliance in supplying products and services that meet user's needs, including cost and schedule. The Past Performance Evaluation is accomplished by reviewing aspects of an offeror's relevant present and recent past performance, focusing on and targeting performance, which is relevant to the Mission Capability subfactors. In determining relevance, consideration will be given to offerors that have produced new or repaired landing gear components only. Further, the new manufacture of gear components provides limited relevance due to limited experience with aged coating, plating removal and restoration; maintenance and service aged metals with induced flaws. The offeror must be able to demonstrate engineering expertise in dealing with these sustainability issues. This information may include data on efforts performed by other divisions, critical subcontractors, or teaming contractors, if such resources will be brought to bear or significantly influence the performance of the proposed effort. The Government may consider as relevant efforts performed for agencies of the federal, state, or local governments and commercial customers. As a result of an analysis of those risks and strengths identified, each offeror will receive an integrated Performance Confidence Assessment, which is rating for the Past Performance factor. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Mission Capability subfactors, the resulting Performance Confidence Assessment is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of the contractor performance. In addition to evaluating the extent to which the offeror's performance meets mission requirements, the assessment will consider things such as the offeror's history of forecasting and controlling costs, adhering to schedules (including the administrative aspects of performance), reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction, and generally, the contractor's business-like concern for the interest of the customer. Pursuant to DFARS 215.305(a)(2), the assessment will consider the extent, to which the offerors evaluated past performance demonstrates compliance with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small, Small Disadvantaged, and Women-Owned Small Business Concerns and FAR 52.219-9, Small, Small Disadvantaged, and Women-Owned Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

Where relevant performance record indicates performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems and appropriateness and effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness.

PART IV-REPRESENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS  
SECTION M (21 Oct 02)  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Each offeror will receive one of the ratings described in AFFARS 5315.305(a)(2)(S-92) for the Past Performance factor.

Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or whom information on past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive a "Neutral/Unknown Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor

More recent and relevant performance will have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent or relevant effort. A strong record of relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral/Unknown Confidence" rating. Likewise, a more relevant past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

Past performance information will be obtained through the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), similar systems of other Government departments and agencies, questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of this acquisition, Defense Contract Management Command (DCMC) channels, interviews with program managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources.

Offerors are to note that, in conducting this assessment, the Government reserves the right to use both data provided by the offeror and data obtained from other sources.

Rating	Definition
<b>Exceptional/High Confidence</b>	Based on the offeror's performance record, essentially no doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
<b>Very Good/Significant Confidence</b>	Based on the offeror's performance record, little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
<b>Satisfactory/Confidence</b>	Based on the offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
<b>Neutral/Unknown Confidence</b>	No performance record identifiable (see FAR 15.305 (a)(2)(iii) and (iv)).
<b>Marginal/Little Confidence</b>	Based on the offeror's performance record, substantial doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.
<b>Unsatisfactory/No Confidence</b>	Based on the offeror's performance record, extreme doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.



PART IV-REPRESENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS  
SECTION M (21 Oct 02)  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

## 2.6 Factor 3: Proposal Risk Factor

Proposal Risk will be evaluated at the Mission Capability subfactor level. The proposal Risk assessment focuses on the risks and weaknesses associated with an offeror's proposal approach and includes an assessment of the potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost, degradation of performance, and the need for increased Government oversight, as well as the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. For each identified risk, the assessment also addresses the offeror's proposal for mitigating the risk and why that approach is or is not manageable. Each Mission Capability subfactor will receive one of the Proposal Risk ratings defined at AFFARS 5315.305(a)(3)(ii).

Rating	Definition
High	Likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Risk may be unacceptable even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Moderate	Can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.
Low	Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

## 2.7 Factor 4: Price/Cost

### Rejection of Unrealistic Offers:

The government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, including contract terms and conditions, or unrealistically high or low in price when compared to government estimates or competitive market prices, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

### Importance of Cost/Price:

The total evaluated price will not be rated or scored, but will be a consideration in the final source selection decision. The evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price; however, cost/price will contribute substantially to the selection decision.

PART IV-REPRESENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS  
SECTION M (21 Oct 02)  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

**Unbalanced Offers:**

Price analysis will be used to determine if the prices for contract line items, including options, are unbalanced. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total solicitation effort price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly over or under-stated as demonstrated by the application of price analysis techniques. Unbalanced pricing may increase performance risk and result in a higher proposal risk rating or the offer may be rejected if the Government determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government (FAR 15.404-1(g)).

**Price Reasonableness:**

Offeror's cost/price proposal will be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404, in order to determine if it is reasonable. A price is reasonable when it provides best value to the government when consideration is given to the current market prices, technical and functional capabilities of the offeror and risk.

**Submission of Cost/Price Data:**

In accordance with FAR 15.403-1 (b), the Government may require submission of cost or pricing data to the extent necessary to determine price reasonableness. When adequate price competition exists, generally no additional information is necessary to determine the reasonableness of price.

**Total Evaluated Price (TEP):**

The offeror shall complete and submit Table TEP to be used for evaluation and award purposes only. Submit in "Then-Year" dollars for the Basic and all applicable Option periods (Nine Options). Provide basic/option period totals as well as a Grand Total.

## EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

### Table TEP

[illegible]

### Sample Task Items / Repair and Delivery:

Cost information will be requested on parts identified in Sub-Factor 1, Mission Capability, in order to determine reasonableness, offeror's knowledge, understanding, and capability to meet requirements. The proposed cost will not be scored separately but will be a consideration in the government's assessment of Sub-Factor 1 in Mission Capability.

### Firm Fixed Price Repair CLINs:

The unit price for each CLIN will be multiplied by the Best estimated Quantity to arrive at an extended total CLIN amount.

**Firm Fixed Priced Hourly Rates CLINs:**

Hourly Rates are comprised of fully loaded hourly rates multiplied by corresponding government estimated hours. The government provided hours are for evaluation purposes only and may not be reflective of the volume of projected work.

**Cost Reimbursable No Fee:**

The estimated amounts for these CLINs are provided by the government and will not be included in the total evaluated price.

PART IV-REPRESENTATION AND INSTRUCTIONS  
SECTION M (21 Oct 02)  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

**Evaluation of Options:**

Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options. The proposed amount for each of these CLINs will be evaluated as part of the total evaluated price.

**General Considerations**

The following general considerations will be considered in the evaluation process:

Plant Visits

The Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) may conduct plant visits during the evaluation phase to gather information for judging the offerors potential for correcting deficiencies, quality of development or manufacturing practices/processes, or other areas useful in evaluating the offer. If conducted, the results will be assessed under the applicable factors/sub factors and will be used to validate and confirm the offerors written and/or oral presentation.

Executive In-Plant Review

During the source selection, the government may perform an executive in-plant review of each offerors facilities to determine each offerors capability to successfully accomplish the program. These reviews may be combined with the PAS.

Pre-Award Survey

The Government may conduct a pre-award survey (PAS) as part of this source selection. Results of the PAS (if conducted) will be evaluated to determine each offerors capability to meet the requirements of the solicitation.